UNITED STATES PATENT AND TRADEMARK OFFICE

UNITED STATES DEPARTMENT OF COMMERCE
United States Patent and Trademark Office
Address: COMMISSIONER FOR PATENTS
P.O. Box 1450
Alexandria, Virginia 22313-1450
www.uspto.gov

APPLICATION NO.	FILING DATE	FIRST NAMED INVENTOR	ATTORNEY DOCKET NO.	CONFIRMATION NO.
09/935,579	08/24/2001	Luca Chiarabini	60004720-3	5207

7590 09/09/2005

HEWLETT-PACKARD COMPANY
Intellectual Property Administration
P. O. Box 272400
Fort Collins, CO 80527-2400

EXAMINER	
POON, KING Y	

ART UNIT	PAPER NUMBER
2624	

DATE MAILED: 09/09/2005

Please find below and/or attached an Office communication concerning this application or proceeding.

Office Action Summary	Application No.	Applicant(s)	
	09/935,579	CHIARABINI ET AL.	
	Examiner	Art Unit	
	King Y. Poon	2624	

-- The MAILING DATE of this communication appears on the cover sheet with the correspondence address --

Period for Reply

A SHORTENED STATUTORY PERIOD FOR REPLY IS SET TO EXPIRE 3 MONTH(S) OR THIRTY (30) DAYS, WHICHEVER IS LONGER, FROM THE MAILING DATE OF THIS COMMUNICATION.

- Extensions of time may be available under the provisions of 37 CFR 1.136(a). In no event, however, may a reply be timely filed after SIX (6) MONTHS from the mailing date of this communication.
- If NO period for reply is specified above, the maximum statutory period will apply and will expire SIX (6) MONTHS from the mailing date of this communication.
- Failure to reply within the set or extended period for reply will, by statute, cause the application to become ABANDONED (35 U.S.C. § 133). Any reply received by the Office later than three months after the mailing date of this communication, even if timely filed, may reduce any earned patent term adjustment. See 37 CFR 1.704(b).

Status

1)☒ Responsive to communication(s) filed on *05 July 2005*.

2a)☒ This action is **FINAL**. 2b)☐ This action is non-final.

3)☐ Since this application is in condition for allowance except for formal matters, prosecution as to the merits is closed in accordance with the practice under *Ex parte Quayle*, 1935 C.D. 11, 453 O.G. 213.

Disposition of Claims

4)☒ Claim(s) *21-28* is/are pending in the application.

4a) Of the above claim(s) _____ is/are withdrawn from consideration.

5)☐ Claim(s) _____ is/are allowed.

6)☒ Claim(s) *21-28* is/are rejected.

7)☐ Claim(s) _____ is/are objected to.

8)☐ Claim(s) _____ are subject to restriction and/or election requirement.

Application Papers

9)☐ The specification is objected to by the Examiner.

10)☐ The drawing(s) filed on _____ is/are: a)☐ accepted or b)☐ objected to by the Examiner.

Applicant may not request that any objection to the drawing(s) be held in abeyance. See 37 CFR 1.85(a).

Replacement drawing sheet(s) including the correction is required if the drawing(s) is objected to. See 37 CFR 1.121(d).

11)☐ The oath or declaration is objected to by the Examiner. Note the attached Office Action or form PTO-152.

Priority under 35 U.S.C. § 119

12)☒ Acknowledgment is made of a claim for foreign priority under 35 U.S.C. § 119(a)-(d) or (f).

a)☒ All b)☐ Some * c)☐ None of:

1.☒ Certified copies of the priority documents have been received.

2.☐ Certified copies of the priority documents have been received in Application No. _____.

3.☐ Copies of the certified copies of the priority documents have been received in this National Stage application from the International Bureau (PCT Rule 17.2(a)).

* See the attached detailed Office action for a list of the certified copies not received.

Attachment(s)

1) ☒ Notice of References Cited (PTO-892)
2) ☐ Notice of Draftsperson's Patent Drawing Review (PTO-948)
3) ☐ Information Disclosure Statement(s) (PTO-1449 or PTO/SB/08) Paper No(s)/Mail Date _____.
4) ☐ Interview Summary (PTO-413) Paper No(s)/Mail Date. _____.
5) ☐ Notice of Informal Patent Application (PTO-152)
6) ☐ Other: _____.

DETAILED ACTION

Claim Rejections - 35 USC § 112

1. The following is a quotation of the first paragraph of 35 U.S.C. 112:

> The specification shall contain a written description of the invention, and of the manner and process of making and using it, in such full, clear, concise, and exact terms as to enable any person skilled in the art to which it pertains, or with which it is most nearly connected, to make and use the same and shall set forth the best mode contemplated by the inventor of carrying out his invention.

2. Claims 22, 23 are rejected under 35 U.S.C. 112, first paragraph, as failing to comply with the written description requirement. The claim(s) contains subject matter which was not described in the specification in such a way as to reasonably convey to one skilled in the relevant art that the inventor(s), at the time the application was filed, had possession of the claimed invention.

Regarding claim 22: The limitation of "wherein the first task comprises downloading compressed data for an image of the document, the second task comprises decompressing the compressed data for the image to provide memory data and applying image processing to the memory data to provide processed memory data and the third task comprises sending the processed memory data through a print driver to a print spooler to provide print-ready data and transferring the print-ready data through an input/output to the printer" are subject matter which was not described in the specification in such a way as to reasonably convey to one skilled in the relevant art that the inventor(s), at the time the application was filed, had possession of the claimed invention.

Regarding claim 23: The limitation of "wherein the first task comprises downloading compressed data for an image of the document, and decompressing the

compressed data for the image to provide memory data, the second task comprise applying image processing to the memory data to provide processed memory data and the third task comprises sending the processed memory data through a print driver to a print spooler to provide print-ready data and transferring the print-ready data through an input/output to the printer" are subject matter which was not described in the specification in such a way as to reasonably convey to one skilled in the relevant art that the inventor(s), at the time the application was filed, had possession of the claimed invention.

It appears, fig. 7 and page 2, lines 20-27, applicant's specification that the function of the three tasks disclosed in claims 22, 23 are actually belongs to five tasks and not three tasks.

Claim Rejections - 35 USC § 103

3. The following is a quotation of 35 U.S.C. 103(a) which forms the basis for all obviousness rejections set forth in this Office action:

> (a) A patent may not be obtained though the invention is not identically disclosed or described as set forth in section 102 of this title, if the differences between the subject matter sought to be patented and the prior art are such that the subject matter as a whole would have been obvious at the time the invention was made to a person having ordinary skill in the art to which said subject matter pertains. Patentability shall not be negatived by the manner in which the invention was made.

4. Claim 21 is rejected under 35 U.S.C. 103(a) as being unpatentable over Kageyama (US 6,025,923) in view of Pardo (US 6,238,105).

Regarding claim 21: Kageyama teaches a method comprising: first, second and third task, (e.g., reception of command, drawing task, printing task, fig. 12), wherein performance of the first second and third tasks in that order are effective to enable a

printer (18, fig. 6) to print an image of a document (column 2, line 24) having multiple images (images of pages, column 2, line 24), the document received from an external source (10, fig. 6) and wherein the third task for a first image, the second task for a second image, and the first task for a third image are performed concurrently (column 18,lines 65-67, column 19, lines 1-3).

Kageyama does not specifically disclose a communication network.

Pardo, in the same area of communication between a host computer and a print control apparatus, teaches it is well known in the art to provide a network for the communication between the host computer and the print control apparatus (column 4, lines 30-40).

Therefore, it would have been obvious to a person with ordinary skill in the art at the time the invention was made to have modified Kageyama to include: provide a network for the communication between the host computer and the print control apparatus.

It would have been obvious to a person with ordinary skill in the art at the time the invention was made to have modified Kageyama by the teaching of Pardo because: (a) it would have provided a most reliable way for communication, and (b) a network would have allowed the system of Kageyama to communicate with other host computers and networks.

5. Claims 22, 23 are rejected under 35 U.S.C. 103(a) as being unpatentable over Kageyama (US 6,025,923) in view of Pardo (US 6,238,105) as applied to claim 21 above, and further in view of applicant's admitted prior art.

Regarding claims 22, 23: Kageyama does not teach wherein the first task comprises downloading compressed data for an image of the document, the second task comprises decompressing the compressed data for the image to provide memory data and applying image processing to the memory data to provide processed memory data and the third task comprises sending the processed memory data through a print driver to a print spooler to provide print-ready data and transferring the print-ready data through an input/output to the printer.

However, applicant, in fig. 1, page 2,lines 20-27, teaches it is prior art that printing tasks is being divided into: downloading compressed data for an image of the document, decompressing the compressed data for the image to provide memory data, applying image processing to the memory data to provide processed memory data and sending the processed memory data through a print driver to a print spooler to provide print-ready data and transferring the print-ready data through an input/output to the printer.

Therefore, it would have been obvious to a person with ordinary skill in the art at the time the invention was made to have applied the method of Kageyama and Pardo to processing the task of: downloading compressed data for an image of the document, decompressing the compressed data for the image to provide memory data, applying image processing to the memory data to provide processed memory data, sending the

processed memory data through a print driver to a print spooler to provide print-ready data, and transferring the print-ready data through an input/output to the printer.

The doing so would have enhance the printing performance of the printer of the prior art as suggested by Kageyama on page 2, lines 20-25.

Note: how the tasks of the prior art printing system of fig. 1, applicant's disclosure, is being group together would have been obvious to a person with ordinary skill in the art because it does not produce unexpected result. Any person could choose to group the tasks in any possible combinations just to be different and having fun.

6. Claims 24-28 are rejected under 35 U.S.C. 103(a) as being unpatentable over applicant's admitted prior art in view of Kageyama (US 6,025,923).

Regarding claim 24: Applicant's admitted prior art teaches a method comprising: downloading compressed pieces of data (page 2, line 21) for images of a document (job, page 2, line 13) having multiple images (page 1, line 27), the compressed pieces of data received from an external source (page 1, lines 7-10) over a communication network (page 1, line18); decompressing the compressed pieces of data to provide pieces of memory data (page 2, line 22); applying image processing to the pieces of memory data to provide processed pieces of memory data (page 2, line 23); sending the processed pieces of memory data through a print driver to a print spooler to provide pieces of print-ready data (page 2, lines 24-25); and transferring the pieces of print-ready data through an input/output to a printer effective to enable the printer to print the

images (page 2, lines 26-27), wherein the acts of downloading decompressing, applying, sending, and transferring are performed in the order for each of the multiple images (fig. 1)

Applicant's admitted prior art does not teach wherein three of more images of the document of these acts are performed concurrently for different images of the document.

Such limitations are taught by Kageyama. Kegeyama, fig. 11-13, column 2, lines 17-25, column 19, lines 1-3, teaches there or more images (pages) of the document and each images having multiple tasks to be performed and these tasks are performed concurrently for different images of the document.

Therefore, it would have been obvious to a person with ordinary skill in the art at the time the invention was made to have modified the admitted prior art by the teaching of Kageyama to include: wherein three of more images of the document of these acts are performed concurrently for different images of the document.

The doing so would have enhance the printing performance of the printer of the prior art as suggested by Kageyama on page 2, lines 20-25.

Regarding claim 25: Admitted prior art teaches wherein the compressed pieces of data comprise raster data (page 2, line 21).

Regarding claim 26: Admitted prior art teaches wherein the communication network comprises a global Internet (page 1, lines 18).

Regarding claim 27: Kageyama and admitted prior art teaches wherein one or more of the multiple images comprises a page of the document (column 2, lines 20-25,

Kageyama, copies/(each copy is a page) of photographs, page 1, line27, applicant's specification).

Regarding claim 28: Kageyama and admitted prior art teaches wherein the acts of downloading, decompressing applying, sending, and transferring are performed five times, once for each of a first, second, third, fourth, and fifth images of the document, and the act of downloading a compressed piece of data for the fifth image is performed concurrently with decompressing a compressed piece of data for the fourth image, applying image processing to a piece of memory data for the third image, sending a processed piece of memory data for the second image, and transferring a processed piece of memory data for the first image (see discussion of claim 24).

7. Applicant's amendment necessitated the new ground(s) of rejection presented in this Office action. Accordingly, **THIS ACTION IS MADE FINAL**. See MPEP § 706.07(a). Applicant is reminded of the extension of time policy as set forth in 37 CFR 1.136(a).

A shortened statutory period for reply to this final action is set to expire THREE MONTHS from the mailing date of this action. In the event a first reply is filed within TWO MONTHS of the mailing date of this final action and the advisory action is not mailed until after the end of the THREE-MONTH shortened statutory period, then the shortened statutory period will expire on the date the advisory action is mailed, and any extension fee pursuant to 37 CFR 1.136(a) will be calculated from the mailing date of

the advisory action. In no event, however, will the statutory period for reply expire later than SIX MONTHS from the date of this final action.

Conclusion

8. Any inquiry concerning this communication or earlier communications from the examiner should be directed to King Y. Poon whose telephone number is 571-272-7440. The examiner can normally be reached on Mon-Fri 8:00-4:30.

If attempts to reach the examiner by telephone are unsuccessful, the examiner's supervisor, David Moore can be reached on 571-272-7437. The fax phone number for the organization where this application or proceeding is assigned is 571-273-8300.

Information regarding the status of an application may be obtained from the Patent Application Information Retrieval (PAIR) system. Status information for published applications may be obtained from either Private PAIR or Public PAIR. Status information for unpublished applications is available through Private PAIR only. For more information about the PAIR system, see http://pair-direct.uspto.gov. Should you have questions on access to the Private PAIR system, contact the Electronic Business Center (EBC) at 866-217-9197 (toll-free).

September 1, 2005

KING Y. POON
PRIMARY EXAMINER